arXiv:1602.08176v1 [math.AP] 26 Feb 2016

POINT-WISE STABILITY OF REACTION DIFFUSION FRONTS

YINGWEI LI

Keywords: Point-wise Semigroup Method; Reaction Diffusion Equation; Nonlinear Stability.

Abstract. Using pointwise semigroup techniques, we establish sharp rates of decay in space and time of a perturbed reaction diffusion front to its time-asymptotic limit. This recovers results of Sattinger, Henry and others of time-exponential convergence in weighted L^p and Sobolev norms, while capturing the new feature of spatial diffusion at Gaussian rate. Novel features of the argument are a point-wise Green function decomposition reconciling spectral decomposition and short-time Nash-Aronson estimates and an instantaneous tracking scheme similar to that used in the study of stability of viscous shock waves.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we revisit the problem of stability of reaction diffusion fronts treated by Sattinger, Henry, and others [Sa,He,TZ] by essentially ODE methods, from the viewpoint of the pointwise semigroup methods introduced in [ZH,MaZ] for the study of stability of viscous shock waves. For simplicity, we treat the semilinear case, with Laplacian diffusion; however, our methods readily extend to the general second-order quasilinear strictly parabolic case (see, e.g., [ZH] in the shock wave case).

From the ODE perspective, a stationary front solution of a spatially homogeneous parabolic system in one dimension is an equilibrium which, due to translation invariance of the underlying system, is embedded in a one-parameter family of nearby equilibria given by its translates. Assuming that the front is a transversal connection of the associated standing-wave ODE, its linearized operator L has a one-dimensional zero eigenspace precluding asymptotic stability. However, under the assumption of a spectral gap, i.e., assuming that the rest of the spectrum has strictly negative real part, one may hope to establish asymptotic orbital stability with time-exponential convergence to an appropriate element of the *family* of nearby fronts.

This is indeed what was shown (among a number of other things; see Remark 1.1 below) by Sattinger [Sa], by what is essentially a stable manifold construction about the (normally hyperbolic) curve of equilibria. A particularly simple alternative argument is sketched by Henry in [He, Exercise 6, p. 108], based on a normal-form reduction approximately decoupling the normal and tangential flows. Another approach, as described, e.g., in [TZ], is to "factor out" the group symmetry of translation, working effectively on the quotient space, and thereby reducing orbital to asymptotic stability.

Date: February 29, 2016.

Remark 1.1. *The main point of [Sa] was to treat spatially inhomogeneous systems arising through the imposition of spatially-weighted norms on reaction-diffusion-convection equation; for a thematically-related study in the finite-dimensional setting, see the argument of Cronin [Cr, p. 198] for stability of time-periodic orbits, featuring a similar stable-manifold construction on the nonautonomous system obtained by Floquet transformation.*

Each of these arguments is based ultimately on the standard spectral decomposition of the linearized solution operator e^{Lt} into the projection $Pf := \phi\langle\tilde\phi, f\rangle$ onto Kernel L, where ϕ and $\tilde\phi$ are right and left zero eigenfunctions, $\langle\tilde\phi,\phi\rangle = 1$, with $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denoting L^2 inner product, plus a time-exponentially decaying portion associated with the complementary eigenspace associated with the remaining stable spectra, together with some form of Duhamel's formula/variation of constants. That is, they all effectively approximate the Green function $G(x,t;y)$ of the linearized equations with the kernel

$$k(x,y) : -\phi(x)\tilde\phi(y) \sim e^{-\eta_\pm|x|-\nu_\pm|y|} \tag{1.1}$$

as $|x|,|y|\to\infty$ of the translational projection P, for some $\eta_\pm,\nu_\pm > 0$.

On the other hand, the Nash-Aronson bounds [N, A] of standard short-time parabolic theory yield that the Green function is bounded above and below by Gaussian distributions:

$$C_1 t^{1/2} e^{-|x-y|^2/M_1 t} \le |G(x,t;y)| \le C_2 t^{1/2} e^{-|x-y|^2/M_2 t}, \tag{1.2}$$

$M_j > 0$ constant, where $C_j > 0$ are bounded above and below for any fixed time interval $0 \le t \le T$. Comparing the quadratic exponential decay of the Gaussian with the linear exponential decay of $k(\cdot,\cdot)$, we see that (1.1), though optimal with respect to time does not give an accurate picture of the spatial propagation of data via Gaussian diffusion. Likewise, the bound (1.2) gives no information about large-time asymptotics.

The goal of the present analysis, as we now describe, is to reconcile these two points of view, obtaining estimates on linear and nonlinear behavior that are optimal both in the large-t and large-x regimes; that is, to reconcile ODE and PDE estimates to obtain sharp pointwise dynamics.

Consider a stationary front solution $u(x,t) = \bar u(x), \lim_{z\to\pm\infty}\bar u(z) = u_\pm$ of a system of reaction diffusion equations

$$u_t = u_{xx} + f(u). \tag{1.3}$$

For simplicity, take $f \in C^\infty$ throughout the paper. Obviously, $\bar u$ satisfies

$$\bar u_{xx} + f(\bar u) = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Linearizing (1.3) about $\bar u$, we have

$$v_t = Lv := v_{xx} + Df(\bar u)v. \tag{1.5}$$

The homogeneous linearized equation

$$v_t - Lv = v_t - v_{xx} - Df(\bar u)v = 0, \quad v|_{t=0} = g \tag{1.6}$$

can be solved by

$$e^{Lt}g = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t;y)g(y)dy \tag{1.7}$$

where $G(x,t;y) = S(t)\delta_y(x)$ is the Green function for (1.6).

Differentiating (1.4), we obtain the standard fact that the translational mode $\bar{u}'$ is a zero eigenfunction of the linearized operator L. Introduce the spectral stability condition:

($\mathcal{D}$): *The operator L has a simple eigenvalue at $\lambda = 0$ (with eigenfunction $\bar{u}'$), with all other eigenvalues of L satisfying* $\mathrm{Re}\lambda < -\eta$ *for some* $\eta > 0$.

Remark 1.2. *This has the consequence that eigenvalues of $Df(u_\pm)$ have strictly negative real parts, corresponding to the stability of the end states $u_\pm$ as equilibria of the reaction ODE, $\dot{u} = f(u)$, ignoring the effects of diffusion.*

Assuming ($\mathcal{D}$), we obtain in standard fashion that the limits $u_\pm$ as $x \to \pm\infty$ of $\bar{u}(x)$ are hyperbolic rest points of (1.4) and thus, by the Stable Manifold Theorem:

Proposition 1.3. *Under assumption ($\mathcal{D}$), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|\bar{u}(x) - u_\pm| \leq Ce^{-\eta|x|}, \quad x \gtrless 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Our first result is a pointwise version of the standard approximation by (1.1):

Proposition 1.4. *Under assumption ($\mathcal{D}$), the Green function can be decomposed as*

$$G(x,t;y) = E(x,t;y) + \tilde{G}(x,t;y) \tag{1.9}$$

$$E(x,t;y) = \bar{u}'(x)e(y,t) \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$e(y,t) = \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y) \tag{1.11}$$

where $\chi(t)$ is a C^∞ smooth cutoff function satisfying $\chi(t) \equiv 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $\chi(t) \equiv 1$ for $t \geq 2$. Define η_0 such that $0 < \eta_0 < \min(\eta/4, \eta')$, then we have

$$|\tilde{G}(x,t;y)| \leq C_1 t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 t - \frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} + C_2 e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)}, \tag{1.12}$$

$$|\tilde{G}_y(x,t;y)| \leq C_1 t^{-1} e^{-\eta_0 t - \frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} + C_2 e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)}, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |e(y,t)| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0|y|}, \quad |e_y(y,t)| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0|y|}, \\ |e_t(y,t)| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0(t+|y|)}, \quad |e_{ty}(y,t)| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0(t+|y|)}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

Our second result refines (1.1), capturing Gaussian spatial propagation of perturbations:

Proposition 1.5. *Under assumption ($\mathcal{D}$), the Green function can be decomposed as*

$$G(x,t;y) = F(x,t;y) + \tilde{H}(x,t;y), \tag{1.15}$$

$$F(x,t;y) = \bar{u}'(x)\tilde{e}(x,t;y), \tag{1.16}$$

and

$$\tilde{e}(x,t;y) = \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)\left(\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right) - \mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right). \tag{1.17}$$

For $0 < \eta_0 < \min(\eta/4, \eta')$, $M > 0$ sufficiently large, and any integer $m \geq 0$,

$$|\tilde{H}(x,t;y)| \leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 t - \frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}, \tag{1.18}$$

$$|\tilde{H}_y(x,t;y)| \le Ct^{-1}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}, \tag{1.19}$$

$$|\partial_t\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)| \le C_m e^{-\eta|y|}\left|\frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{Mt}}}{\sqrt{t+1}}-\frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y-t)^2}{Mt}}}{\sqrt{t+1}}\right|. \tag{1.20}$$

From Proposition 1.4, we obtain the following theorem recovering the L^p results of [Sa,He]:

Theorem 1.6 (Nonlinear Stability)**.** *Assuming* $(\mathcal{D})$*, for any* $p_0 \ge 0$*, stationary solutions* $\bar{u}(x)$ *of* (1.3) *are nonlinearly stable in* $L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty$ *and nonlinearly orbitally asymptotically stable in* L^p*,* $p \ge p_0$*, with respect to initial perturbations* u_0 *that are sufficiently small in* $L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty$*. More precisely, for some* $C>0$ *and* $\alpha \in W^{1,\infty}(t)$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))|_{L^p(x)} &\le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},\\
|\dot{\alpha}(t)| &\le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},\\
|\alpha(t)| &\le C|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},\\
|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^p}(t) &\le C|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t\ge 0$*,* $p_0 \le p \le \infty$*, for solutions* $\tilde{u}$ *of* (1.3) *with* $|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0}$ *sufficiently small.*

From Proposition 1.5, we obtain the following improved theorem describing at once both time-exponential decay and Gaussian spatial diffusion of perturbations:

Theorem 1.7 (Pointwise Nonlinear Stability)**.** *Assuming* $(\mathcal{D})$*, for*

$$|u_0(x)| = |\tilde{u}(x,0)-\bar{u}(x)| \le E_0 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{M}}$$

with $E_0>0$ *sufficiently small, then* $\tilde{\alpha}\in W^{k,p}(x)\cap W^{1,\infty}(t)$*, for all* $k\ge 0, 1\le p\le\infty$*. Furthermore, we have the point-wise bounds*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{u}(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t)-\bar{u}(x)| &\le CE_0(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}t-\frac{|x|^2}{2M(1+t)}},\\
|\tilde{\alpha}(x,t)| &\le CE_0\left|\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x+t}{\sqrt{Mt}}\right)-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{-x+t}{\sqrt{Mt}}\right)\right|,\\
|\partial_t^k\partial_x^m\tilde{\alpha}(x,t)| &\le CE_0\left(e^{-\frac{|x+t|^2}{Mt}}+e^{-\frac{|x-t|^2}{Mt}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\eta_0>0$ *small enough and* $C, M>0$ *large enough.*

Note that, differently than in Theorem 1.6, the phase shift $\tilde{\alpha}(x,t)$ in Theorem 1.7 is allowed to vary in x as well as t, paralleling the linear behavior of $\tilde{e}$.

1.1. **Discussion.** Stability of reaction diffusion fronts has been much studied, by a variety of techniques. Indeed, the bounds on $\tilde{G}$ stated in Proposition 1.4 may be recognized as exactly what one expects for a sectorial ordinary differential operator possessing an exponential dichotomy, or, equivalently, a spectral gap, and could be obtained by a number of different (standard) methods. They serve here, along with the argument for Theorem 1.6, as a bridge linking such standard methods with the approach used to establish Proposition 1.5 and Theorem 1.7, which represent the novel aspects of this work. To our knowledge, no such results have up to now been obtained, despite the long history of the subject, and the

naturality of the question they answer: of how PDE properties such as parabolicity intervene in the ODE-like asymptotic behavior of the solution.

The latter are obtained by suitable adaptations of the "pointwise semigroup" methods introduced in [ZH, MaZ] for the treatment of the neutral case of stability of viscous shock waves, for which the associated linearized operator does not possess a spectral gap; see [Z, Li] for particularly accessible accounts specializing to the scalar case. The treatment here of the more standard case with spectral gap both illuminates the method, and shows that it can give new details even in the background of strong, time-exponential decay. In the pointwise semigroup method, the resolvent and solution operators are replaced by their kernels, which may then be studied separately in different (x, y, t) domains; this is particularly natural for questions as addressed here of behavior in specific asymptotic situations.

Note that, in the nonlinear part of the argument, we have generalized the approach of [ZH, MaZ] by allowing phase shifts depending on x as well as t. This is similar to, and motivated by, techniques introduced for the study of stability of periodic traveling wave [JZ, JNRZ], where it is crucial for completion of a nonlinear stability argument. Our results here show that, also in the traveling front or pulse case, where it is not needed in order to close a nonlinear stability argument, allowing α to depend on x is a useful tool, that can be used to obtain additional details about behavior.

Note, finally, that the Green function bounds of Proposition 1.5 both recover and extend the classical Nash-Aronson bounds, identifying a "parabolic" regime $|x-y| \gg t$ on which they dominate behavior, including, but not limited to the classical bounded-time regime.

1.2. **Acknowledgment.** This project was completed while studying within the PhD program at Indiana University, Bloomington. Thanks to my thesis advisor Kevin Zumbrun for suggesting the problem and for helpful discussions.

2. Point-wise Semigroup Methods

We study the *resolvent kernel* $G_\lambda(x,y)$, defined formally by $G_\lambda(\cdot, y) := (L-\lambda I)^{-1}\delta_y$, or equivalently $(L-\lambda I)^{-1}f(x) = \int G_\lambda(x,y)f(y)dy$, that is, the elliptic Green function associated with $(L-\lambda I)$. At an isolated eigenvalue λ_0 of L, the spectral projection operator can be defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_0} = \mathrm{Res}_{\lambda_0}(L-\lambda I)^{-1}.$$

The operator L is sectorial, so we have the spectral resolution formula,

$$e^{Lt} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma e^{\lambda t}(L-\lambda I)^{-1}d\lambda, \tag{2.1}$$

for the solution operator e^{Lt} of $v_t = Lv; \quad v(0) = v_0$, where Γ is the boundary of an appropriate sector $\{\lambda : \mathrm{Re}\lambda < \theta_1 - \theta_2|\mathrm{Im}\lambda|\}$ containing the spectrum of L, $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ are constants. We have assumed that L has an isolated simple eigenvalue at $\lambda = 0$, the rest of the spectrum is separated by a *positive spectral gap* $\eta > 0$, $\sigma(L)\setminus\{0\} \subset \{\lambda : \mathrm{Re}\lambda \le -\eta\}$. Defining $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as the boundary of the set $\Omega := \{\lambda : \mathrm{Re}\lambda < \theta_1 - \theta_2|\mathrm{Im}\lambda|\} \cap \{\lambda : \mathrm{Re}\lambda \le -\eta/2\}$, we have by (2.1), together with Cauchy's theorem, that

$$e^{Lt} = \mathrm{Res}_0 e^{\lambda t}(L-\lambda I)^{-1} + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}(L-\lambda I)^{-1}d\lambda.$$

Applying both sides of the above equation to $\delta_y(x)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} G(x,t;y) &= \bar{u}'(x)\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}\frac{e^{\lambda t}}{\lambda}d\lambda\right)\tilde{\psi}(y) + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda \\ &= \bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\psi}(y) + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda \\ &= \bar{u}'(x)\chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y) + \bar{u}'(x)(1-\chi(t))\tilde{\psi}(y) + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda \\ &= \bar{u}'(x)e(y,t) + \tilde{G}(x,t;y), \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined $e(y,t) = \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)$, and

$$\tilde{G}(x,t;y) = \bar{u}'(x)(1-\chi(t))\tilde{\psi}(y) + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda.$$

The cutoff function $\chi(t) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is identically 0 for $0 \le t \le 1$, and identically 1 for $t \ge 2$, and $\chi'(t)$ approaches 0 exponentially as $t \to +\infty$.

3. The Asymptotic Eigenvalue Equations

The eigenvalue equation $Lw = \lambda w$ associated with (1.5) is

$$w_{xx} + Df(\bar{u})w = \lambda w. \tag{3.1}$$

Written as a first-order system in the variable $W = (w, w')^t$, this becomes

$$W' = \mathbb{A}(x;\lambda)W, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbb{A}(x;\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -(\lambda I + Df(\bar{u})) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We begin by studying the limiting, constant coefficient systems $L_\pm w = \lambda w$ of (3.1) at $x = \pm\infty$,

$$w_{xx} + Df(u_\pm)w = \lambda w, \tag{3.3}$$

or, written as a first-order system,

$$W' = \mathbb{A}_\pm(\lambda)W, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\mathbb{A}_\pm(\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -(\lambda I + Df(u_\pm)) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

The normal modes of (3.4) are $V_j^\pm e^{\mu_j^\pm x}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 2n$, where $\mu_j^\pm$, $V_j^\pm$ are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\mathbb{A}_\pm$; these are easily seen to satisfy $V_j^\pm = \begin{pmatrix} v_j^\pm \\ \mu_j^\pm v_j^\pm \end{pmatrix}$, $v_j^\pm \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $[(\mu_j^\pm)^2 I + \lambda I + Df(u_\pm)]v_j^\pm = 0$. Let $\sigma_1^\pm, \sigma_2^\pm, \ldots, \sigma_n^\pm$ be the eigenvalues of $Df(u_\pm)$, then we have the equation, $(\mu_j^\pm)^2 + \lambda = -\sigma_j^\pm$, solve for $\mu_j^\pm$, we get $\mu_j^\pm = \pm\sqrt{-\sigma_j^\pm - \lambda}$. Since we have assumed that $\mathrm{Re}\sigma_j^\pm < 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and λ is on a contour which lies completely in the half plane $\{\mathrm{Re}\lambda < 0\}$, then one of $\sqrt{-\sigma_j^\pm - \lambda}$ and $-\sqrt{-\sigma_j^\pm - \lambda}$ has positive real part while the other has negative real part. After some rearrangement we have the following:

Proposition 3.1. *For some $\eta' > 0$, there locally exist analytic choices $\mathrm{Re}\mu_1^\pm, \ldots, \mathrm{Re}\mu_n^\pm \leq -\eta' < 0 < \eta' \leq \mathrm{Re}\mu_{n+1}^\pm, \ldots, \mathrm{Re}\mu_{2n}^\pm$, and $V_1^\pm, \ldots, V_{2n}^\pm$ for the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\mathbb{A}_\pm(\lambda)$, satisfying $-\mathrm{Re}\mu_j^\pm = \mathrm{Re}\mu_{n+j}^\pm \geq \eta' > 0$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and*

$$\mu_j^\pm(\lambda) = -\gamma_j^\pm - a_j^\pm \lambda - b_j^\pm \lambda^2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3), \qquad \mu_{n+j}^\pm(\lambda) = \gamma_j^\pm + a_j^\pm \lambda + b_j^\pm \lambda^2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3),$$
$$V_j^\pm(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} r_j^\pm + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) \\ -\gamma_j^\pm r_j^\pm + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad V_{n+j}^\pm(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} r_j^\pm + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) \\ \gamma_j^\pm r_j^\pm + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}.$$

where $\gamma_j^\pm, a_j^\pm$ and $b_j^\pm$ are some constants such that $\mathrm{Re}\gamma_j^\pm \geq \eta' > 0$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. $r_j^\pm$ are the right eigenvectors of $Df(u_\pm)$ corresponding to eigenvalues $\sigma_j^\pm$.

Lemma 3.2. *The adjoint of the operator $Lw = w_{xx} + Df(\bar{u})w$ is $L^*z = z_{xx} + zDf(\bar{u})$.*

Proof. Let $A(x) = Df(\bar{u}(x))$, then the conclusion follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Lw, z\rangle &= \int zLwdx = \int z(w_{xx} + Aw)dx = \int zw_{xx}dx + \int zAwdx \\ &= \int z_{xx}wdx + \int zAwdx = \int (z_{xx} + zA)wdx = \langle w, L^*z\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

(**Note:** Here, w is an n-dimensional column vector and z is an n-dimensional row vector.)

Lemma 3.3. *Let $H_\lambda(x, y)$ denote the Green function for the adjoint operator $(L - \lambda I)^*$ of $L - \lambda I$. Then, $H_\lambda(x, y) = G_\lambda(y, x)^*$. In particular, for $y \neq x$ and x fixed, the matrix $z(y) = G_\lambda(x, y)$ satisfies*

$$z_{yy} + zDf(\bar{u}(y)) = \lambda z. \tag{3.5}$$

Consider (3.5) as an ODE for general row vector z, or, written as a first order system,

$$Z' = Z\tilde{\mathbb{A}}(x; \lambda), \tag{3.6}$$

where $Z = (z, z')$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}(x; \lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(\lambda I + Df(\bar{u})) \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Z is a solution of (3.6) if and only if $Z\mathcal{S}W \equiv$ Constant for any solution W of (3.2), where $\mathcal{S} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} (Z\mathcal{S}W)' &= (-z'w + zw')' = -z''w - z'w' + z'w' + zw'' \\ &= -z''w + zw'' = -(\lambda z - zA)w + z(\lambda w - Aw) \\ &= -\lambda zw + zAw + \lambda zw - zAw = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly, we define the adjoint asymptotic matrices $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\pm(\lambda) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(\lambda I + Df(u_\pm)) \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Proposition 3.5. *Under assumption $(\mathcal{D})$, $|\mathbb{A}(x; \lambda) - \mathbb{A}_\pm(\lambda)| \leq Ce^{-\eta|x|}$ as $x \to \pm\infty$ and $|\tilde{\mathbb{A}}(x; \lambda) - \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_\pm(\lambda)| \leq Ce^{-\eta|x|}$ as $x \to \pm\infty$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from (1.8). □

4. Construction of the Resolvent Kernel

Define $W_1^\pm(x;\lambda), W_2^\pm(x;\lambda), \dots, W_{2n}^\pm(x;\lambda)$ as a bases of solutions to (3.2), and $\tilde{W}_1^\pm(x;\lambda), \tilde{W}_2^\pm(x;\lambda), \dots, \tilde{W}_{2n}^\pm(x;\lambda)$ as a bases of solutions to the adjoint first order ODE (3.6), satisfying the relation

$$\tilde{W}_j^\pm \mathcal{S} W_k^\pm = \delta_k^j, \tag{4.1}$$

Applying the Gap Lemma of [GZ, ZH] relating variable- to constant-coefficient solutions, we obtain:

Proposition 4.1. *We have the following asymptotic description of $\tilde{W}_j^\pm$ and $W_k^\pm$:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_j^\pm(x;\lambda) &= \tilde{V}_j^\pm(\lambda) e^{-\mu_j^\pm(\lambda)x}(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|x|})), \quad \text{for} \quad j=1,2,\dots,2n;\\
W_k^\pm(x;\lambda) &= V_k^\pm(\lambda) e^{\mu_k^\pm(\lambda)x}(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|x|})), \quad \text{for} \quad k=1,2,\dots,2n,
\end{aligned}$$

where $V_j^\pm$, $\mu_j^\pm$ are as in Proposition 3.1.

Definition 4.2. *We define the decaying modes of (3.2) as*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi^+ &= (\phi_1^+,\dots,\phi_n^+) = (W_1^+,\dots,W_n^+),\\
\Phi^- &= (\phi_1^-,\dots,\phi_n^-) = (W_{n+1}^-,\dots,W_{2n}^-).
\end{aligned}$$

and the growing modes of (3.2) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi^+ &= (\psi_1^+,\dots,\psi_n^+) = (W_{n+1}^+,\dots,W_{2n}^+),\\
\Psi^- &= (\psi_1^-,\dots,\psi_n^-) = (W_1^-,\dots,W_n^-).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we define the growing modes of (3.6) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Phi}^+ &= (\tilde{\phi}_1^+,\dots,\tilde{\phi}_n^+)^t = (\tilde{W}_1^+,\dots,\tilde{W}_n^+)^t,\\
\tilde{\Phi}^- &= (\tilde{\phi}_1^-,\dots,\tilde{\phi}_n^-)^t = (\tilde{W}_{n+1}^-,\dots,\tilde{W}_{2n}^-)^t.
\end{aligned}$$

and the decaying modes of (3.6) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Psi}^+ &= (\tilde{\psi}_1^+,\dots,\tilde{\psi}_n^+)^t = (\tilde{W}_{n+1}^+,\dots,\tilde{W}_{2n}^+)^t,\\
\tilde{\Psi}^- &= (\tilde{\psi}_1^-,\dots,\tilde{\psi}_n^-)^t = (\tilde{W}_1^-,\dots,\tilde{W}_n^-)^t.
\end{aligned}$$

From this definition we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi}_j^\pm \mathcal{S} \phi_k^\pm = \delta_k^j; \quad \tilde{\phi}_j^\pm \mathcal{S} \psi_k^\pm = 0,\\
\tilde{\psi}_j^\pm \mathcal{S} \phi_k^\pm = 0; \quad \tilde{\psi}_j^\pm \mathcal{S} \psi_k^\pm = \delta_k^j.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

or written as matrix form $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}^\pm \\ \tilde{\Psi}^\pm \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{S} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi^\pm, \Psi^\pm \end{pmatrix} = I.$

Lemma 4.3.

$$\begin{bmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{bmatrix}_{(y)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{S}^{-1},$$

where $[h(x)]_{(y)}$ denotes the jump in $h(x)$ at $x=y$, and $\mathcal{S}$ is as in Lemma 3.4.

Proof. Expanding $\delta_y(x) = (L-\lambda I)G_\lambda = G_{\lambda,xx} + AG_\lambda - \lambda G_\lambda$, and comparing orders of singularity, we find that $G_{\lambda,xx}(x,y) = \delta_y(x)$ and $AG_\lambda - \lambda G_\lambda = 0$, thus

$$G_{\lambda,x} = H_y(x) = \begin{cases} I, & \text{for } x \geq y; \\ 0, & \text{for } x < y. \end{cases}$$

gives $[G_{\lambda,x}]_{(y)} = I$ and $[G_\lambda]_{(y)} = 0$. Differentiating $[G_\lambda]_{(y)}$ in y, we obtain

$$[G_{\lambda,x}]_{(y)} + [G_{\lambda,y}]_{(y)} = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}y}[G_\lambda]_{(y)} = 0,$$

thus $[G_{\lambda,y}]_{(y)} = -I$. Differentiating again we find that $[G_{\lambda,xy}]_{(y)} = -\frac{1}{2}\left([G_{\lambda,xx}]_{(y)} + [G_{\lambda,yy}]_{(y)}\right)$. Finally we can determine $[G_{\lambda,xx}]_{(y)}$ and $[G_{\lambda,yy}]_{(y)}$ by $G_{\lambda,xx} = \lambda G_\lambda - AG_\lambda$, $G_{\lambda,yy} = \lambda G_\lambda - G_\lambda A$. It is easy to find that $[G_{\lambda,xx}]_{(y)} = 0$ and $[G_{\lambda,yy}]_{(y)} = 0$, thus $[G_{\lambda,xy}]_{(y)} = 0$. □

From $(L-\lambda I)G_\lambda(x,y) = \delta_y(x)I$, $(L-\lambda I)^* H_\lambda(x,y) = \delta_y(x)I$ we know that $\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda(x,y) \\ G_{\lambda,x}(x,y) \end{pmatrix}$ viewed as a function of x satisfies (3.2)(differentiating with respect to x), while $(G_\lambda(x,y), G_{\lambda,y}(x,y))$ viewed as function of y satisfies (3.6) (differentiating with respect to y). Furthermore, note that both $G_\lambda(x,\cdot)$ and $G_\lambda(\cdot,y)$ decay at $\pm\infty$ for λ on the resolvent set, since $|(L-\lambda I)^{-1}| < \infty$ and $|(L-\lambda I)^{*-1}| < \infty$ imply $\|G_\lambda(\cdot,y)\|_{L^1(x)} < \infty$ and $\|G_\lambda(x,\cdot)\|_{L^1(y)} < \infty$ respectively. Combining, we have the representation

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{cases} \Phi^+(x;\lambda)M^+(\lambda)\tilde{\Psi}^-(y;\lambda) & \text{for } x > y; \\ -\Phi^-(x;\lambda)M^-(\lambda)\tilde{\Psi}^+(y;\lambda) & \text{for } x < y, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

where matrices $M^{\pm}(\lambda)$ are to be determined.

Combining Lemmas 4.3 and (4.3), we have

$$\left(\Phi^+(y), \Phi^-(y)\right) \begin{pmatrix} M^+(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & M^-(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^-(y) \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+(y) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{S}^{-1}, \quad \text{or}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} M^+(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & M^-(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} &= \left(\Phi^+(y), \Phi^-(y)\right)^{-1} \mathcal{S}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^-(y) \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+(y) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^-(y) \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+(y) \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{S} \left(\Phi^+(y), \Phi^-(y)\right) \right)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^-\mathcal{S}\Phi^+ & \tilde{\Psi}^-\mathcal{S}\Phi^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+\mathcal{S}\Phi^+ & \tilde{\Psi}^+\mathcal{S}\Phi^- \end{pmatrix}^{-1}(y) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^-\mathcal{S}\Phi^+ & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\Psi}^+\mathcal{S}\Phi^- \end{pmatrix}^{-1}(y) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\tilde{\Psi}^-\mathcal{S}\Phi^+)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (\tilde{\Psi}^+\mathcal{S}\Phi^-)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

thus $M^+(\lambda) = (\tilde{\Psi}^-\mathcal{S}\Phi^+)^{-1}$, $M^-(\lambda) = (\tilde{\Psi}^+\mathcal{S}\Phi^-)^{-1}$.

Proposition 4.4. *On Ω,*

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j,k} M^+_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^+_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) \tag{4.4}$$

for $y \le 0 \le x$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j,k} d^+_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) + \sum_k \psi^-_k(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) \tag{4.5}$$

for $y \le x \le 0$, where

$$M^+ = (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-, \quad d^+ = -(0,I)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^- \tag{4.6}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = -\sum_{j,k} M^-_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^+_k(y;\lambda) \tag{4.7}$$

for $x \le 0 \le y$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j,k} d^-_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) - \sum_k \phi^-_k(x;\lambda)\tilde{\phi}^-_k(y;\lambda) \tag{4.8}$$

for $x \le y \le 0$, where

$$M^- = \tilde{\Phi}^- \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+ \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix}, \quad d^-(\lambda) = \tilde{\Phi}^- \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^+ \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Proof. For $y \le 0 \le x$, according to (4.3),

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n M^+_{ij}(\lambda)\phi^+_i(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_j(y;\lambda) \tag{4.9}$$

We may express M^+ using the duality relation (4.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} M^+ &= (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\mathcal{S}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^- \\ \tilde{\Phi}^- \end{pmatrix}^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Psi}^- \\ \tilde{\Phi}^- \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{S}\right)^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}(\Psi^-,\Phi^-)\begin{pmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for $y \le x \le 0$, expressing each $\phi^+_i(x;\lambda)$ as a linear combination of basis elements at $-\infty$,

$$\phi^+_i(x;\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n a^+_{ji}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^n b^+_{ji}(\lambda)\psi^-_j(x;\lambda), \tag{4.10}$$

we plug this into (4.9) to derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n M^+_{il}(\lambda)\phi^+_i(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda) \\ = &\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n M^+_{il}(\lambda)\sum_{j=1}^n a^+_{ji}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n} M^+_{il}(\lambda)\sum_{j=1}^{n} b^+_{ji}(\lambda)\psi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda)\\
=\;&\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a^+_{ji}(\lambda)M^+_{il}(\lambda)\right)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda)\\
&+\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b^+_{ji}(\lambda)M^+_{il}(\lambda)\right)\psi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda)\\
=\;&\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{k} d^+_{jl}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda)+\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n} e^+_{jl}(\lambda)\psi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_l(y;\lambda).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we are defining

$$
\begin{aligned}
d^+_{jl}(\lambda) &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n} a^+_{ji}(\lambda)M^+_{il}(\lambda), \quad d^+ = a^+M^+;\\
e^+_{jl}(\lambda) &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n} b^+_{ji}(\lambda)M^+_{il}(\lambda), \quad e^+ = b^+M^+.
\end{aligned}
$$

where a, b, d, e are all $n \times n$ matrices.

Rewriting (4.10) as $\Phi^+ = \Phi^- a^+ + \Psi^- b^+ = (\Phi^-, \Psi^-)\begin{pmatrix} a^+ \\ b^+ \end{pmatrix}$, and using the relation $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^- \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{S}(\Phi^-, \Psi^-) = I$, we have $\begin{pmatrix} a^+ \\ b^+ \end{pmatrix} = (\Phi^-, \Psi^-)^{-1}\Phi^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^- \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{S}\Phi^+$

Finally,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\begin{pmatrix} d^+ \\ e^+ \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} a^+ \\ b^+ \end{pmatrix} M^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^- \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{S}\Phi^+(I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-\\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}^- \\ \tilde{\Psi}^- \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{S}(\Phi^+,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-\\
&= (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}\Pi_+\Psi^-\\
&= (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}(I-\Pi_-)\Psi^-\\
&= (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}(I-(0,\Phi^-)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1})\Psi^-\\
&= (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}\Psi^- - (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}(0,\Phi^-)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-\\
&= (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}(\Phi^-,\Psi^-)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} - (\Phi^-,\Psi^-)^{-1}(\Phi^-,\Psi^-)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-\\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have $d^+ = -(0,I)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-$, $e^+ = I$, and so we can rewrite (4.9) as

$$
\begin{pmatrix} G_\lambda & G_{\lambda,y} \\ G_{\lambda,x} & G_{\lambda,xy} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j,k} d^+_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^-_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) + \sum_k \psi^-_k(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda).
$$

□

5. Low and Bounded Frequency Bounds on the Resolvent Kernel

Lemma 5.1. *Under assumption* $(\mathcal{D})$*, for* $|\lambda|$ *bounded,*

$$|M^{\pm}_{jk}(\lambda)|, |d^{\pm}_{jk}(\lambda)| \leq C, \tag{5.1}$$

for some constant $C > 0$*.*

Proof. Expanding $M^+ = (I,0)(\Phi^+,\Phi^-)^{-1}\Psi^-$ using Kramer's rule, and setting $x = 0$, we obtain $M^{\pm}_{jk} = D^{-1}C^{\pm}_{jk}$, where $C^+ = (I,0)\left(\Phi^+,\Phi^-\right)^{\text{adj}}\Psi^-$ and $D = \det\left(\Phi^+,\Phi^-\right)$. It is evident that $|C^{\pm}|$ is uniformly bounded and therefore $|M^{\pm}_{jk}| \leq C_1|D|^{-1} \leq C$, by $(\mathcal{D})$, where C is a uniform constant. Similar bounds hold for $d^{\pm}_{jk}$. □

Proposition 5.2. *Assuming* $(\mathcal{D})$*, for* $|\lambda|$ *bounded, the resolvent kernel* $\tilde{G}_\lambda$ *satisfies the estimates*

$$|\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)| \leq Ce^{-\eta'(|x|+|y|)}. \tag{5.2}$$

where η' *is as defined in Proposition 3.1.*

Proof. We only prove the case where $y \leq 0 \leq x$, the rest is similar. According to Proposition 4.4, the Green kernel can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,k} M^+_{jk}(\lambda)\phi^+_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{\psi}^-_k(y;\lambda) = \sum_{j,k} M^+_{jk}(\lambda)W^+_j(x;\lambda)\tilde{W}^-_k(y;\lambda)\\
= &\sum_{j,k} M^+_{jk}(\lambda)V^+_j(\lambda)e^{\mu^+_j(\lambda)x}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|x|})\right)\tilde{V}^-_k(\lambda)e^{-\mu^-_k(\lambda)y}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|y|})\right)\\
= &\sum_{j,k} M^+_{jk}(\lambda)V^+_j(\lambda)\tilde{V}^-_k(\lambda)e^{-\gamma^+_j x}e^{\gamma^-_k y}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|x|})\right)\left(1+\mathcal{O}(e^{-(\eta/2)|y|})\right)\\
\leq &\; Ce^{-(\gamma^+_j-\eta')x}e^{(\gamma^-_k-\eta')y}e^{-\eta' x}e^{\eta' y} \leq Ce^{-\eta' x}e^{\eta' y} = Ce^{-\eta'(|x|+|y|)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

6. High Frequency Bounds on the Resolvent Kernel

Define $\Omega_\theta = \{\lambda : \text{Re}(\lambda) \geq -\theta_1 - \theta_2|\text{Im}(\lambda)|\}$, $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$, assuming $(\mathcal{D})$, we have the following estimates for $G_\lambda(x,y)$.

Proposition 6.1. *Assuming* $(\mathcal{D})$*, it follows that for some* $C, \beta, R > 0$ *and* $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ *sufficiently small,*

$$\begin{aligned}
|G_\lambda(x,y)| &\leq C|\lambda|^{-1/2}e^{-\beta^{-1/2}|\lambda|^{1/2}|x-y|},\\
|G_{\lambda,x}(x,y)|, |G_{\lambda,y}(x,y)| &\leq Ce^{-\beta^{-1/2}|\lambda|^{1/2}|x-y|};
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

for all $\lambda \in \Omega_\theta \setminus B(0,R)$*.*

Proof. The proof of these estimates can be found in for example [ZH]. □

7. Point-wise Bounds on the Green Function

Now we prove the pointwise bounds for $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ and $e(y,t)$ stated in Proposition 1.4.

Proof of Proposition 1.4. To derive the bounds on $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, we consider two cases depending on the scale of $\frac{|x-y|}{t}$.



We define the contour $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as the union of bounded-λ part $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$ and large-λ part $\tilde{\Gamma}_2$, where $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$ is the line segment connecting $-\frac{\eta}{2}-\kappa i$ and $-\frac{\eta}{2}+\kappa i$, $\tilde{\Gamma}_2$ is the boundary of the sector $\Omega_\theta = \{\lambda : \mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \geq -\theta_1 - \theta_2|\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)|\}$, $\theta_1 = \frac{\eta}{4}, \theta_2 = \frac{\eta}{4\kappa}$ outside the ball $B\left(0, \sqrt{(\frac{\eta}{2})^2+\kappa^2}\right)$.

Case I. ($\frac{|x-y|}{t}$ large). We first derive the bounds for the Green kernel $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ in the rather trivial case that $\frac{|x-y|}{t} \geq S$, S sufficiently large, the regime in which standard short-time parabolic theory applies. Set

$$\bar{\alpha} := \frac{|x-y|}{2\beta t}, \quad R := \beta\bar{\alpha}^2 = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right)^2+\kappa^2}, \tag{7.1}$$

where β is as in Proposition 6.1, and consider again the representation of $\tilde{G}$:

$$\tilde{G}(x,t;y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_1\cup\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_1} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda,$$

By the large $|\lambda|$ estimates of Proposition 6.1, we have for all $\lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}_2$ that

$$|\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)| \leq C|\lambda|^{-1/2}e^{-\beta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}|x-y|}. \tag{7.2}$$

Further, we have

$$\mathrm{Re}\lambda = -\frac{\eta}{2}, \quad \lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}_1, \tag{7.3}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\lambda \leq \mathrm{Re}\lambda_0 - \theta_2(|\mathrm{Im}\lambda| - |\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|), \quad \lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}_2, \tag{7.4}$$

for R sufficiently large, where λ_0 and λ_0^* are the two points of intersection of $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_2$.

Combining (7.2), (7.3) and (7.1), we obtain

$$\left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_1} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| \leq C\left|\int_{-\kappa}^{\kappa} e^{\left(-\frac{\eta}{2}+\xi i\right)t}e^{-\eta'(|x|+|y|)}d\xi\right| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)}.$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| &\leq \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} C|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda)t-\beta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}|x-y|}d\lambda \\
&\leq Ce^{\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_0)t-\beta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\lambda_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}|x-y|}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2}|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda-\mathrm{Re}\lambda_0)t}d\lambda \\
&\leq Ce^{-\beta\bar{\alpha}^2 t}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2^+}|\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\theta_2(\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0)t}|d(\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0)| \\
&= Ce^{-\beta\bar{\alpha}^2 t}\int_0^{+\infty} s^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\theta_2 ts}ds = Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\beta\bar{\alpha}^2 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these last two estimates, and recalling (7.1), we have

$$Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\beta\bar{\alpha}^2 t}{2}}e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{8\beta t}} \leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{8\beta t}},$$

for $\eta_0 > 0$ independent of $\bar{\alpha}$. We find that $|\tilde{G}(x,t;y)|$ can be bounded by the term

$$\mathcal{O}\left(C_1 t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} + C_2 e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)}\right).$$

Case II. ($\frac{|x-y|}{t}$ bounded). In order to derive the bounds on $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ in this regime, let us recall the representation formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{G}(x,t;y) &= \bar{u}'(x)(1-\chi(t))\tilde{\psi}(y) + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda, \\
\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_1} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda + \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

First, we estimate the $\tilde{\Gamma}_2$ part of $\tilde{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| &\leq \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda)t}|\tilde{G}_\lambda||d\lambda| \leq \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2} e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda_0)t-\theta_2(|\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|)t}C|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{2}}|d\lambda| \\
&\leq Ce^{-\eta t}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2}|\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\theta_2(|\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|)t}|d(\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0)| \\
&= 2C(\theta_2 t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta t}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = C_1 t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta t} \leq C_2 t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}}.
\end{aligned}$$

for $C_0 > 0$ large enough.

Next we estimate the $\tilde{\Gamma}_1$ part of $\tilde{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\tilde{\Gamma}_1} e^{\lambda t}\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| &\leq C\left|\int_{-\kappa}^{\kappa} e^{(-\frac{\eta}{2}+\xi i)t}e^{-\eta'(|x|+|y|)}d\xi\right| \\ &= Ce^{-\frac{\eta}{2}t}e^{-\eta'(|x|+|y|)}\left|\int_{-\kappa}^{\kappa} e^{i\xi t}d\xi\right| \\ &\leq Ce^{-(\eta/2)t-\eta'(|x|+|y|)} \leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}}.\end{aligned}$$

for $0<\eta_0<\frac{\eta}{2}$ and $C_0>0$ large enough. Thus we know that $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ is bounded by $C_1 t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}}+C_2 e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)}$ in both $\frac{|x-y|}{t}$ large and bounded cases.

Finally notice that the $\bar{u}'(x)(1-\chi(t))\tilde{\psi}(y)$ part will vanish for $t\gg 1$, so it can be absorbed in one of the above estimates. This completes the proof of bounds on $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, the bounds on $\tilde{G}_y(x,t;y)$ can be derived similarly. We just need to notice that in the estimate of $\tilde{G}_{\lambda,y}(x,y)$ for large-λ is different from the same estimate of $\tilde{G}_\lambda(x,y)$ by a factor of $|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, thus the large-λ ($\tilde{\Gamma}_2$) part of the bounds on $\tilde{G}_y(x,t;y)$ is different from the $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ one by a factor of $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, while the bounded-λ ($\tilde{\Gamma}_1$) part stays the same.

Next we move on to estimate $e(y,t)$. Recall that we have $e(y,t)=\chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)$, along with the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_t(t) &\leq Ce^{-\eta_0 t}, \text{ for } t\geq 0, \\ \tilde{\psi}(y) &\leq Ce^{-\eta|y|}, \text{ for } y\gtrless 0, \\ \tilde{\psi}_y(y) &\leq Ce^{-\eta|y|}, \text{ for } y\gtrless 0.\end{aligned}$$

Combining, we get the stated bounds for $e(y,t)$. □

8. Improved Point-wise Bounds on the Green Function

Next we prove the bounds stated in Proposition 1.5.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. We first derive the bounds for the total Green kernel $G(x,t;y)$ in the rather trivial case that $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\geq S$, S sufficiently large, the regime in which standard short-time parabolic theory applies. Set

$$\bar{\alpha}:=\frac{|x-y|}{2\beta t},\quad R:=\beta\bar{\alpha}^2, \tag{8.1}$$

where β is as in Proposition 6.1, and consider again the representation of G:

$$G(x,t;y)=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_1\cup\Gamma_2} e^{\lambda t}G_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda,$$

where $\Gamma_1:=\partial B(0,R)\cap\bar{\Omega}_\theta$ and $\Gamma_2:=\partial\Omega_\theta\setminus B(0,R)$. Note that the intersection of Γ with the real axis is $\lambda_{\min}=R=\beta\bar{\alpha}^2$. By the large $|\lambda|$ estimates of Proposition 6.1, we have for all $\lambda\in\Gamma_1\cup\Gamma_2$ that

$$|G_\lambda(x,y)|\leq C|\lambda|^{-1/2}e^{-\beta^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\lambda|^{\frac{1}{2}}|x-y|}. \tag{8.2}$$

Further, we have

$$\mathrm{Re}\lambda \leq R(1-\eta_2\omega^2), \quad \lambda\in\Gamma_1, \tag{8.3}$$

$$\mathrm{Re}\lambda \leq \mathrm{Re}\lambda_0 - \theta_2(|\mathrm{Im}\lambda| - |\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0|), \quad \lambda\in\Gamma_2, \tag{8.4}$$

for R sufficiently large, where ω is the argument of λ and λ_0 and λ_0^* are the two points of intersection of Γ_1 and Γ_2, for some $\eta_2>0$ independent of $\bar\alpha$. Combining (8.2),(8.3) and (8.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\Gamma_1} e^{\lambda t}G_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| &\leq \int_{\Gamma_1} C|\lambda|^{-\frac12}e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda)t-\beta^{-\frac12}|\lambda|^{\frac12}|x-y|}d\lambda\\ &\leq C\int_{\Gamma_1} R^{-\frac12}e^{R(1-\eta_2\omega^2)t-\beta^{-\frac12}R^{\frac12}2\beta\bar\alpha t}d\lambda = CR^{\frac12}e^{-\beta\bar\alpha^2 t}\int_{-M}^{+M} e^{-R\eta_2 t\omega^2}d\omega\\ &\leq Ct^{-\frac12}e^{-\beta\bar\alpha^2 t}.\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\Gamma_2} e^{\lambda t}G_\lambda(x,y)d\lambda\right| &\leq \int_{\Gamma_2} C|\lambda|^{-\frac12}e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda)t-\beta^{-\frac12}|\lambda|^{\frac12}|x-y|}d\lambda\\ &\leq Ce^{\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_0)t-\beta^{-\frac12}|\lambda_0|^{\frac12}|x-y|}\int_{\Gamma_2}|\lambda|^{-\frac12}e^{(\mathrm{Re}\lambda-\mathrm{Re}\lambda_0)t}d\lambda\\ &\leq Ce^{Rt-\beta^{-\frac12}R^{\frac12}2\beta\bar\alpha t}2\int_{\Gamma_2^+}|\lambda|^{-\frac12}e^{-\theta_2(\mathrm{Im}\lambda-\mathrm{Im}\lambda_0)t}|d\lambda|\\ &\leq Ce^{-\beta\bar\alpha^2 t}\int_0^{+\infty} s^{-\frac12}e^{-\theta_2 ts}ds = Ct^{-\frac12}e^{-\beta\bar\alpha^2 t}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining these last two estimates, and recalling (8.1), we have

$$|G(x,t;y)| \leq Ct^{-\frac12}e^{-\frac{\beta\bar\alpha^2 t}{2}}e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{8\beta t}} \leq Ct^{-\frac12}e^{-\eta_2 t}e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{8\beta t}},$$

for $\eta_2>0$ independent of $\bar\alpha$, hence $|G(x,t;y)| = \mathcal{O}\left(t^{-\frac12}e^{-\eta_0 t}e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}}\right)$ for $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\geq S$.

Secondly, to prove the bound stated for $\tilde H$, recall that

$$\begin{aligned}F(x,t;y) &= E(x,t;y)\left(\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right),\\ E(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y) &= E(x,t;y)\left(1-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)+\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde H(x,t;y) = G(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y), \tag{8.5}$$

$$\tilde H(x,t;y) = \tilde G(x,t;y)+(E(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y)). \tag{8.6}$$

Here is the plan, for the case $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\geq S$ for some large enough S defined in the proof of Proposition 1.4, we use (8.5) with the bound on the total Green function $G(x,t;y)$ above and the bound on $F(x,t;y)$ that we are about to show. For the case $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\leq S$, we use

(8.6) with the bound on $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$ derived in the proof of Proposition 1.4 and the bound on $E(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y)$ we are going to derive.

Case I. $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\leq\frac{1}{2}$**.** In this situation, we have $|x-y|\leq\frac{1}{2}t$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{t} &\leq \tfrac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}} \leq \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{t}\\ -\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{t} &\leq \tfrac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}} \leq -\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{t}\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathrm{errfn}(x):=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{x}e^{-z^2}dz$. From this we get

$$\begin{aligned}&1-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)+\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\\ =\;&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-z^2}dz-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}}e^{-z^2}dz+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}}e^{-z^2}dz\\ =\;&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-z^2}dz-\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}}e^{-z^2}dz\right)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}}e^{-z^2}dz\\ =\;&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}}^{+\infty}e^{-z^2}dz+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}}e^{-z^2}dz,\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|1-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)+\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right|\\ \leq\;&\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{t}}^{+\infty}e^{-z^2}dz+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{-\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{t}}e^{-z^2}dz=\mathrm{erfc}\left(\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{t}\right)\leq e^{-\frac{1}{16}t},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that for the complementary error function $\mathrm{erfc}(x):=\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{x}^{+\infty}e^{-z^2}dz$, there is the estimate $\mathrm{erfc}(x)\leq e^{-x^2}$. Together with the fact that $E(x,t;y)=\bar{u}'(x)e(y,t)=\chi(t)\bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\psi}(y)$, and $|\bar{u}'(x)|\leq Ce^{-\eta|x|}$, $|\tilde{\psi}(y)|\leq Ce^{-\eta|y|}$ for some $\eta>0$, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}|E(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y)| &= \left|E(x,t;y)\left(1-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)+\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right)\right|\\ &\leq Ce^{-\eta|x|}e^{-\eta|y|}e^{-\frac{1}{16}t}\leq Ce^{-\eta|x-y|-\frac{1}{16}t}\\ &= Ct^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\eta_0 t+\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t-\eta\frac{|x-y|}{t}t-\frac{1}{16}t}\cdot t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t}\\ &= Ct^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\left(\frac{1}{16}-\eta_0-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}+\eta\frac{|x-y|}{t}\right)t}\cdot t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t}\\ &\leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}},\end{aligned}$$

for $0<\eta_0<\frac{1}{16}$ and $M>0$ large enough because $\frac{|x-y|}{t}$ is bounded. Together with the estimate $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)\leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$ for $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, we derive that $\tilde{H}(x,t;y)\leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$.

Case II. $\frac{1}{2}\leq\frac{|x-y|}{t}\leq S$**.**

$$|E(x,t;y)-F(x,t;y)|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left| E(x,t;y)\left(1-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)+\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right)\right| \\
&\le Ce^{-\eta|x|}e^{-\eta|y|} \le Ce^{-\eta|x-y|} \\
&= Ct^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\eta_0 t+\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t-\eta\frac{|x-y|}{t}t}\cdot t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t} \\
&= Ct^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\left(\eta\frac{|x-y|}{t}-\eta_0-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}\right)t}\cdot t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt^2}t} \\
&\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}},
\end{aligned}
$$

for $0<\eta_0<\frac{1}{2}\eta$ and $M>0$ large enough because $\frac{|x-y|}{t}$ is bounded. Together with the estimate $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$ for $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, we derive that $\tilde{H}(x,t;y)\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$.

Case III. $\frac{|x-y|}{t}\ge S$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
|F(x,t;y)| &= \left| E(x,t;y)\left(\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)-\mathrm{errfn}\left(\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}\right)\right)\right| \\
&\le Ce^{-\eta|x|}e^{-\eta|y|}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{\frac{x-y-t}{\sqrt{4t}}}^{\frac{x-y+t}{\sqrt{4t}}} e^{-z^2}dz \\
&\le Ce^{-\eta|x-y|}\sqrt{t}\max\left(e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{4t}},e^{-\frac{(x-y-t)^2}{4t}}\right) \\
&\le Ce^{-\eta\frac{|x-y|}{t}t}t^{\frac{1}{2}}\max\left(e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{4t}},e^{-\frac{(x-y-t)^2}{4t}}\right) \\
&\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $\eta_0>0$ small enough and $M>0$ large enough. Together with the estimate for the total Green function $G(x,t;y)$, $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$ for $\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, we derive that $\tilde{H}(x,t;y)\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}$. □

9. Estimates on the Green Kernel

Now we are ready to carry out the $L^p\to L^p$ estimation on the Green function $G(x,t;y)$.

Proposition 9.1. *The Green function G decomposes as $G(x,t;y)=\bar{u}'(x)e(y,t)+\tilde{G}(x,t;y)$, for some $C>0$, and all $t>0$, $1\le p\le\infty$,*

$$
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{G}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}\le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}, \tag{9.1}
$$

$$
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{G}_y(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}\le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}, \tag{9.2}
$$

and

$$
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e(y,t)h(y)dy\right|\le C|h|_{L^p},\ \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e_y(y,t)h(y)dy\right|\le C|h|_{L^p}, \tag{9.3}
$$

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_t(y,t)h(y)dy\right| \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}, \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_{ty}(y,t)h(y)dy\right| \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}. \tag{9.4}$$

Proof. First, we carry out the proof of (9.1). Using Proposition 1.4, we have the following estimates on $|\tilde{G}(x,t;y)|_{L^1(x)}$:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 t - \frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} dx = t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 t} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} dx = Ce^{-\eta_0 t},$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)} dx = e^{-\eta_0 t} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0|x-y|} dx = e^{-\eta_0 t} \left(2\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0 \xi} d\xi\right) = Ce^{-\eta_0 t},$$

thus

$$|\tilde{G}(x,t;y)|_{L^1(x)} \le C \left| t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 t - \frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0 t}} \right|_{L^1(x)} + C \left| e^{-\eta_0(t+|x-y|)} \right|_{L^1(x)} \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}.$$

This implies that

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{G}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)} \le \sup_y |\tilde{G}(x,t;y)|_{L^1(x)}|h|_{L^p} \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p},$$

which completes the proof of (9.1).

Next, in order to prove (9.3) and (9.4), we note that $e(y,t) = \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)$ and $|\tilde{\psi}(y)|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}$ is bounded, so that gives us for $q = \frac{p}{p-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t)h(y)dy\right| &= \left|\textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)h(y)dy\right| \le C|\tilde{\psi}|_{L^q}|h|_{L^p} \le C|h|_{L^p}, \\
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_y(y,t)h(y)dy\right| &= \left|\textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \chi(t)\tilde{\psi}_y(y)h(y)dy\right| \le C|\tilde{\psi}_y|_{L^q}|h|_{L^p} \le C|h|_{L^p}, \\
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_t(y,t)h(y)dy\right| &= \left|\textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \chi_t(t)\tilde{\psi}(y)h(y)dy\right| \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde{\psi}|_{L^q}|h|_{L^p} \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}, \\
\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_{ty}(y,t)h(y)dy\right| &= \left|\textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \chi_t(t)\tilde{\psi}_y(y)h(y)dy\right| \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde{\psi}_y|_{L^q}|h|_{L^p} \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 9.2. *The Green function G decomposes as $G(x,t;y) = \bar{u}'(x)\tilde{e}(x,t;y) + \tilde{H}(x,t;y)$, for some $C > 0$, and all $t > 0$, $1 \le p \le \infty$,*

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{H}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)} \le C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)} e^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^1}, \tag{9.5}$$

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{H}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)} \le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^p}, \tag{9.6}$$

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{H}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)} \le C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p}\right)} e^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^{p_0}}, \tag{9.7}$$

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{H}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)}e^{-\eta_0 t}|h|_{L^2}, \tag{9.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}|h|_{L^1},\\ \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}}|h|_{L^1},\end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}|h|_{L^p},\\ \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{m+1}{2}}|h|_{L^p},\end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}|h|_{L^{p_0}},\\ \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{p_0}-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}}|h|_{L^{p_0}},\end{aligned} \tag{9.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}|h|_{L^2},\\ \left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\partial_t\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}&\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}}|h|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

Proof. First, we prove inequality (9.5). Recall that $\tilde{H}$ has the bound

$$|\tilde{H}(x,t;y)|\leq Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}},$$

we have the following estimate on $|\tilde{H}(x,t;y)|_{L^p}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\left(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4C_0t}}\right)^p dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\ =\;& t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-\frac{p|x-y|^2}{4C_0t}}dx\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}=t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}\left(2\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-\frac{p\xi^2}{4C_0t}}d\xi\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\ =\;& t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 t}2^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-\zeta^2}d\zeta\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{4C_0t}{p}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\ =\;& Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)}e^{-\eta_0 t}\leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)}e^{-\eta_0 t},\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\left|\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{H}(x,t;y)h(y)dy\right|_{L^p(x)}$$

$$\leq \sup_y |\tilde{H}(x,t;y)|_{L^p(x)} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} h(y)dy \right| \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{1}{p})} e^{-\eta_0 t} |h|_{L^1},$$

proving (9.5). Inequality (9.6) can be proved similarly, and inequality (9.7) can be obtained through L^p-interpolation.

Next, let us move on to the estimate of $\tilde{e}(x,t;y)$. It can be shown that $\partial_t \partial_x^m \tilde{e}(x,t;y)$ has the form

$$\chi(t)\tilde{\psi}(y) \left(\left(C_{m+1} \frac{(x-y+t)^m (x-y-t)}{t^{m+1+\frac{1}{2}}} + \cdots \right) e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{4t}} \right.$$
$$\left. + \left(C'_{m+1} \frac{(x-y-t)^m (x-y-3t)}{t^{m+1+\frac{1}{2}}} + \cdots \right) e^{-\frac{(x-y-t)^2}{4t}} \right),$$

for $t \geq 1$, we compute the following integral,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(t^{-(m+1+\frac{1}{2})} |x-y+t|^{m+1} e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{4t}} \right)^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \;& t^{-(m+1+\frac{1}{2})} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |x-y+t|^{mp+p} e^{-\frac{p(x-y+t)^2}{4t}} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \;& t^{-(m+1+\frac{1}{2})} \left(2\int_0^{+\infty} \xi^{mp+p} e^{-\frac{p\xi^2}{4t}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \;& t^{-(m+1+\frac{1}{2})} 2^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \zeta^{mp+p} e^{-\zeta^2} d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{4t}{p}} \right)^{m+1+\frac{1}{p}} \\
= \;& C t^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}} \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(t^{-(m+1+\frac{1}{2})} |x-y-t|^{m+1} e^{-\frac{|x-y-t|^2}{4t}} \right)^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
\leq \;& C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_t \partial_x^m \tilde{e}(x,t;y) h(y) dy \right|_{L^p(x)} \\
\leq \;& \sup_y |\partial_t \partial_x^m \tilde{e}(x,t;y)|_{L^p(x)} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} h(y)dy \right| \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{m+1}{2}} |h|_{L^1},
\end{aligned}$$

proving (9.9). Inequality (9.10) can be proved similarly, and inequality (9.11) can be obtained through L^p-interpolation. □

10. Integral Representation for L^p Iteration Scheme

Letting $\tilde{u}$ be a second solution of (1.3), define the perturbation

$$u(x,t) := \tilde{u}(x+\alpha(t),t) - \bar{u}(x) \tag{10.1}$$

as the difference between a translate of $\tilde{u}$ and the background wave $\bar{u}$. This yields after a brief computation the perturbation equation

$$\begin{aligned} u_t - Lu &= f(u+\bar{u}) + \bar{u}_{xx} - Df(\bar{u})u + \dot{\alpha}(t)(u_x + \bar{u}_x) \\ &= f(u+\bar{u}) - f(\bar{u}) - Df(\bar{u})u + \dot{\alpha}(t)(u_x + \bar{u}_x) \\ &=: N(u,\bar{u}) + \dot{\alpha}(t)(u_x + \bar{u}_x) \end{aligned} \tag{10.2}$$

where $Lu = u_{xx} + Df(\bar{u})u$ and $N(u,\bar{u}) = f(u+\bar{u}) - f(\bar{u}) - Df(\bar{u})u$.

Applying Duhamel's principle to (10.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t;y)u_0(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t-s;y)[N(u,\bar{u}) + \dot{\alpha}(u_x + \bar{u}_x)](y,s)dyds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t;y)u_0(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t-s;y)[N(u,\bar{u})(y,s) + \dot{\alpha}(s)u_x(y,s)]dyds \\ &\quad + \alpha(t)\bar{u}'(x) \end{aligned}$$

where $u_0(x) := u(x,0)$. Here, we have used the facts that $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} G(x,t-s;y)\bar{u}'(y)dy = e^{Lt}\bar{u}'(x) = \bar{u}'(x)$ and $\alpha(0) = 0$ (because $e(y,0) = 0$.) Expanding $G(x,t;y)$ using (1.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (\bar{u}'(x)e(y,t) + \tilde{G}(x,t;y))u_0(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (\bar{u}'(x)e(y,t-s) + \tilde{G}(x,t-s;y))[N(u,\bar{u})(y,s) + \dot{\alpha}(s)u_x(y,s)]dyds \\ &\quad + \alpha(t)\bar{u}'(x) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{G}(x,t;y)u_0(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{G}(x,t-s;y)[N(u,\bar{u})(y,s) + \dot{\alpha}(s)u_x(y,s)]dyds \\ &\quad + \bar{u}'(x)\left(\alpha(t) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t)u_0(y)dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t-s)[N(u,\bar{u})(y,s) + \dot{\alpha}(s)u_x(y,s)]dyds\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we define $\alpha(t)$ as

(10.3)
$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(t) &= -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t)u_0(y)dy - \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t-s)[N(u,\bar{u})(y,s)+\dot{\alpha}(s)u_x(y,s)]dyds\\ &= -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t)u_0(y)dy - \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e(y,t-s)N(u,\bar{u})(y,s)dyds\\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_y(y,t-s)\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)dyds,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain the integral representations

(10.4)
$$\begin{aligned}u(x,t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{G}(x,t;y)u_0(y)dy + \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{G}(x,t-s;y)N(u,\bar{u})(y,s)dyds\\ &\quad - \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\tilde{G}_y(x,t-s;y)\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)dyds\end{aligned}$$

and

(10.5)
$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\alpha}(t) &= -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_t(y,t)u_0(y)dy - \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_t(y,t-s)N(u,\bar{u})(y,s)dyds\\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e_{ty}(y,t-s)\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)dyds.\end{aligned}$$

11. L^p Nonlinear Iteration and L^p Nonlinear Stability

Associated with the solution $(u,\dot{\alpha})$ of the integral system (10.3) and (10.4), we define

(11.1)
$$\zeta(t) := \sup_{0\le s\le t, p_0\le p\le\infty}\left(|u(x,s)|_{L^p(x)} + |\dot{\alpha}(s)|\right)e^{\eta_0 s}.$$

Lemma 11.1. *For all $t\ge 0$ for which $\zeta(t)$ is finite, some $C>0$, and*

$$E_0 := |u_0|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty} = |u(x,0)|_{L^{p_0}(x)\cap L^\infty(x)} = |\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},$$

(11.2)
$$\zeta(t)\le C(E_0+\zeta(t)^2).$$

Proof. Use Taylor expansion of $f(u+\bar{u})$ in $N(u,\bar{u}) = f(u+\bar{u})-f(\bar{u})-Df(\bar{u})u$ to derive $N(u,\bar{u}) = \mathcal{O}(|u|^2)$.

We have then the following estimates of $|N(u,\bar{u})|_{L^p}(s)$ and $|\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)|_{L^p(y)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}|N(u,\bar{u})(y,s)|_{L^p(y)} &\le C|u|_{L^p}(s)|u|_{L^\infty}(s) &&\le C\zeta^2(s)e^{-2\eta_0 s}\\ |\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)|_{L^p(y)} &\le C|u|_{L^p}(s)|\dot{\alpha}(s)| &&\le C\zeta^2(s)e^{-2\eta_0 s}\end{aligned}$$

Since we already have the bounds on $\tilde{G}$ and e, we can now estimate $|u(\cdot,t)|_{L^p(x)}$. Using the representation (10.4) of $u(x,t)$ together with estimates (9.1) and (9.2),

$$\begin{aligned}|u(\cdot,t)|_{L^p(x)} &\le Ce^{-\eta_0 t}E_0 + C\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}|N(u,\bar{u})|_{L^p}(s)ds\\ &\quad + C\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}|\dot{\alpha}(s)u(y,s)|_{L^p}(s)ds\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq Ce^{-\eta_0 t}E_0 + C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$+ C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$\leq C(E_0+\zeta(t)^2)e^{-\eta_0 t}.$$

Similarly, for $|\dot\alpha(t)|$, using (10.5) together with (9.4) we have,

$$|\dot\alpha(t)| \leq Ce^{-\eta_0 t}E_0 + C\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}|N(u,\bar u)|_{L^p}(s)ds$$
$$+ C\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}|\dot\alpha(s)u(y,s)|_{L^p}(s)ds$$
$$\leq Ce^{-\eta_0 t}E_0 + C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$+ C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$\leq C(E_0+\zeta(t)^2)e^{-\eta_0 t}.$$

Rearranging the above two estimates together we obtain (11.2). □

Finally, we give a proof of the main theorem, Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. The first two bounds are proved by continuous induction. Taking $E_0 < \frac{1}{4C^2}$, we have therefore that $\zeta(t) < 2CE_0$ whenever $\zeta(t) \leq 2CE_0$, and so the set of $t \geq 0$ for which $\zeta(t) < 2CE_0$ is equal to the set of $t \geq 0$ for which $\zeta(t) \leq 2CE_0$. Recalling that ζ is continuous wherever it is finite, we find that the set of $t \geq 0$ for which $\zeta(t) < 2CE_0$ is both open and closed. Taking without loss of generality $C > 1/2$, so that $t = 0$ is contained in this set, then the set is nonempty. It follows that $\zeta(t) < 2CE_0$ for all $t \geq 0$, yielding the first two bounds.

The third follows using (10.3) together with (9.3),

$$|\alpha(t)| \leq CE_0 + C\int_0^t |N(u,\bar u)|_{L^p}(s)ds + C\int_0^t |\dot\alpha(s)u(y,s)|_{L^p}(s)ds$$
$$\leq CE_0 + C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds + C\zeta^2(t)\int_0^t e^{-2\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$\leq CE_0 + C_1E_0^2 \leq C_2E_0.$$

To show the last inequality, notice that

$$\tilde u(x,t) - \bar u(x) = u(x-\alpha(t),t) - (\bar u(x) - \bar u(x-\alpha(t))),$$

so that $|\tilde u(\cdot,t) - \bar u|$ is controlled by the sum of $|u|$ and $\bar u - \bar u(x-\alpha(t)) = \alpha(t)|\bar u'(x)|$, hence remains $\leq CE_0$ for all $t \geq 0$, for E_0 sufficiently small. □

Corollary 11.2. *The translate function $\alpha(t)$ in (10.3) converges to a limit α_∞ as $t \to \infty$, and we have the following estimates,*

$$|\alpha(t) - \alpha_\infty| \quad \leq \quad Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde u - \bar u|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0},$$

$$|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha_\infty)|_{L^p(x)} \quad \leq \quad Ce^{-\eta_0 t}|\tilde{u}-\bar{u}|_{L^{p_0}\cap L^\infty}|_{t=0}.$$

Proof. Take a sequence $0<t_0<t_1<\ldots<t_n<t_{n+1}<\ldots$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} t_n=\infty$, then we have for $m<n, m,n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$|\alpha(t_n)-\alpha(t_m)|\leq|\dot{\alpha}((1-\theta)t_m+\theta t_n)||t_n-t_m|\leq Ce^{-\eta_0((1-\theta)t_m+\theta t_n)}|t_n-t_m|\to 0$$

as $m,n\to\infty$, thus $\{\alpha(t_n)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence hence there exist a α_∞ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha(t_n)=\alpha_\infty.$$

This shows the existence of α_∞, then we prove the first inequality. Indeed,

$$|\alpha(t)-\alpha_\infty|=\left|\int_t^\infty\dot{\alpha}(s)ds\right|\leq\left|\int_t^\infty CE_0e^{-\eta_0 s}ds\right|\leq C_3E_0e^{-\eta_0 t}.$$

The second inequality follows using Theorem 1.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha_\infty)|_{L^p(x)}\\
&\leq|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))+\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))-\bar{u}(x-\alpha_\infty)|_{L^p(x)}\\
&\leq|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))|_{L^p(x)}+|\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))-\bar{u}(x-\alpha_\infty)|_{L^p(x)}\\
&=|\tilde{u}(x,t)-\bar{u}(x-\alpha(t))|_{L^p(x)}+|\bar{u}'(x_\theta)(\alpha(t)-\alpha_\infty)|_{L^p(x)}\\
&\leq CE_0e^{-\eta_0 t}+C_4E_0e^{-\eta_0 t}\leq CE_0e^{-\eta_0 t}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the Corollary. □

12. Integral Representation for H^K and Point-wise Iteration Schemes

Let $\tilde{u}(x,t)$ be a solution of the system of reaction diffusion equations

$$u_t=u_{xx}+f(u)$$

and define $u(x,t)=\tilde{u}(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t)$ for some unknown function $\tilde{\alpha}:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{R}$ to be determined later. Moreover, let $\bar{u}(x)$ be a stationary solution and define

$$v(x,t)=u(x,t)-\bar{u}(x)=\tilde{u}(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t)-\bar{u}(x) \tag{12.1}$$

Lemma 12.1. *For v, u as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
u_t-u_{xx}-f(u)=&(\partial_t-L)\,\bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\alpha}(x,t)+\partial_x R\\
&+(\partial_t+\partial_x^2)S+(f(v(x,t)+\bar{u}(x))-Df(\bar{u}(x)))\,\tilde{\alpha}_x,
\end{aligned} \tag{12.2}$$

where

$$R:=v\tilde{\alpha}_t+v\tilde{\alpha}_{xx}+(\bar{u}_x(x)+v_x(x,t))\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x^2}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}=O\left(|v|(|\tilde{\alpha}_t|+|\tilde{\alpha}_{xx}|)+\left(\frac{|\bar{u}_x|+|v_x|}{1-|\tilde{\alpha}_x|}\right)|\tilde{\alpha}_x|^2\right)$$

and

$$S:=-v\tilde{\alpha}_x=O\left(|v|\cdot|\tilde{\alpha}_x|\right).$$

Proof. Using the fact that $\tilde{u}_t-\tilde{u}_{xx}-f(\tilde{u})=0$, it follows by a straightforward computation that

$$u_t-f(u)-u_{xx}=\tilde{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_t-\tilde{u}_t\tilde{\alpha}_x-(\tilde{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x+f(\tilde{u})\tilde{\alpha}_x, \tag{12.3}$$

where it is understood that the argument of the function $\tilde{u}$ and its derivatives appearing on the righthand side are evaluated at $(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t)$. Moreover, by another direct calculation, using the fact that

$$L(\bar{u}'(x)) = \left(\partial_x^2 + Df(\bar{u})\right)\bar{u}'(x) = 0,$$

by translation invariance, we have

$$(\partial_t - L)\,\bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\alpha} = \bar{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_t - (\bar{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x - \bar{u}_{xx}\tilde{\alpha}_x = \bar{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_t - (\bar{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x + Df(\bar{u})\tilde{\alpha}_x.$$

Subtracting, and using the facts that, by differentiation of $(\bar{u}+v)(x,t) = \tilde{u}(x+\tilde{\alpha},t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_x + v_x &= \tilde{u}_x(1+\tilde{\alpha}_x), \\ \bar{u}_t + v_t &= \tilde{u}_t + \tilde{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_t, \end{aligned} \tag{12.4}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_x - \bar{u}_x - v_x &= -(\bar{u}_x + v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}, \\ \tilde{u}_t - \bar{u}_t - v_t &= -(\bar{u}_x + v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_t}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}, \end{aligned} \tag{12.5}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_t - f(u) - u_{xx} = (\partial_t - L)\bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\alpha} + v_x\tilde{\alpha}_t - v_t\tilde{\alpha}_x - (v_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x \\ + \left((\bar{u}_x + v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x^2}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}\right)_x + \left(f(v+\bar{u}) - Df(\bar{u})\right)\tilde{\alpha}_x, \end{aligned}$$

yielding (12.2) by $v_x\tilde{\alpha}_t - v_t\tilde{\alpha}_x = (v\tilde{\alpha}_t)_x - (v\tilde{\alpha}_x)_t$ and $(v_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x = (v\tilde{\alpha}_x)_{xx} - (v\tilde{\alpha}_{xx})_x$. □

Corollary 12.2. *The nonlinear residual v defined in (12.1) satisfies*

$$(\partial_t - L)\,v = (\partial_t - L)\,\bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\alpha} + Q + R_x + (\partial_x^2 + \partial_t)S + T, \tag{12.6}$$

where

$$Q := f(v(x,t) + \bar{u}(x)) - f(\bar{u}(x)) - Df(\bar{u}(x))v = \mathcal{O}(|v|^2), \tag{12.7}$$

$$R := v\tilde{\alpha}_t + v\tilde{\alpha}_{xx} + (\bar{u}_x + v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x^2}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}, \tag{12.8}$$

$$S := -v\tilde{\alpha}_x = \mathcal{O}(|v||\tilde{\alpha}_x|), \tag{12.9}$$

and

$$T := \left(f(v+\bar{u}) - Df(\bar{u})\right)\tilde{\alpha}_x = \mathcal{O}(|v||\tilde{\alpha}_x|). \tag{12.10}$$

Proof. Straightforward Taylor expansion comparing (12.2) and $\bar{u}_t - f(\bar{u}) - \bar{u}_{xx} = 0$. □

Using Corollary 12.2 and applying Duhamel's principle we obtain the integral (implicit) representation

$$\begin{aligned} v(x,t) =& \bar{u}'(x)\tilde{\alpha}(x,t) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x,t;y)v_0(y)dy \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(x,t-s;y)\left(Q + R_y + (\partial_y^2 + \partial_s)S + T\right)(y,s)dyds \end{aligned}$$

for the nonlinear perturbation v. Thus, if we define $\bar{\alpha}$ implicitly via the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\alpha}(x,t) := &-\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{e}(x,t;y)v_0(y)dy \\ &-\int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{e}(x,t-s;y)\left(Q+R_y+(\partial_y^2+\partial_s)S+T\right)(y,s)dyds,\end{aligned} \tag{12.11}$$

we obtain the integral representation

$$\begin{aligned}v(x,t) = &\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \widetilde{H}(x,t;y)v_0(y)dy \\ &+\int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \widetilde{H}(x,t-s;y)\left(Q+R_y+(\partial_y^2+\partial_s)S+T\right)(y,s)dyds.\end{aligned} \tag{12.12}$$

Moreover, differentiating and recalling that $\tilde{e}(x,t;y)=0$ for $0<t\leq 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t^k\partial_x^m\tilde{\alpha}(x,t) := &-\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_t^k\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t;y)v_0(y)dy \\ &-\int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_t^k\partial_x^m\tilde{e}(x,t-s;y)\left(Q+R_y+(\partial_y^2+\partial_s)S+T\right)(y,s)dyds.\end{aligned} \tag{12.13}$$

Together, these form a complete system in the variables $\left(v,\partial_t^k\tilde{\alpha},\partial_x^m\tilde{\alpha}\right)$, $0\leq k\leq 1$, $0\leq m\leq K+1$, $K\geq 2$ is a constant. In particular, given a solution of the system we may afterward recover the shift function $\tilde{\alpha}$.

Now, from the original differential equation (12.6) together with (12.13), we readily obtain short-time existence and continuity with respect to t of solution $(v,\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)\in H^K$ by a standard contraction-mapping argument treating the linear $Df(\bar{u})v$ term of the left-hand side along with $Q,R,S,T,\tilde{\alpha}\bar{u}'$ terms of the right-hand side as sources in the heat equation.

13. H^K Nonlinear Iteration

Associated with the solution $(u,\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)$ of the integral system (12.12)-(12.13), we define

$$\zeta_1(t) := \sup_{0\leq s\leq t}\left(\|v\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}(s)e^{\eta_0 s}+\|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}(s)(1+s)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right). \tag{13.1}$$

By short time $H^K(\mathbb{R})$ existence theory, the quantities $\|v\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}$ are continuous so long as they remain small. Thus, ζ_1 is a continuous function of t as long as it remains small. We now use the linearized Green function estimates of Section 9 to prove that if ζ_1 is initially small then it must remain so.

Lemma 13.1. *For all $t\geq 0$ for which $\zeta_1(t)$ is sufficiently small, we have the estimate*

$$\zeta_1(t)\leq C\left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)$$

for some constant $C>0$, so long as $E_0 := \|v(\cdot,0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})\cap H^K(\mathbb{R})}$ is also sufficiently small.

Proof. To begin, notice that by the descriptions of Q, T, R, and S in Corollary 12.2 we have that

$$\|Q(\cdot,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}\leq \|v\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}^2 \lesssim \zeta_1(t)^2e^{-2\eta_0 t}$$

$$\|R_y(\cdot,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \le \|v\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}\|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)\|_{H^{K+1}(x;\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \zeta_1(t)^2 e^{-\eta_0 t}(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$
$$\|T(\cdot,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \le \|v\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}\|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)\|_{H^{K+1}(x;\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \zeta_1(t)^2 e^{-\eta_0 t}(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$
$$\|(\partial_t+\partial_x^2)S(\cdot,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} \le \|v\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}\|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)\|_{H^{K+1}(x;\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \zeta_1(t)^2 e^{-\eta_0 t}(1+t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$

so long as $\|(v_x,\tilde\alpha_x)(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \le \|(v,\tilde\alpha_x)\|_{H^K(x;\mathbb{R})}(t) \le \zeta_1(t)$ remains bounded.

Thus, applying the bounds (9.8) and (9.12) of Proposition 9.2 to representations (12.12)-(12.13), we obtain for any $2 \le p \le \infty$ the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)}E_0 \\ &\quad + \zeta_1^2(t)\int_0^t (1+t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)} e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}\left(e^{-2\eta_0 s}+e^{-\eta_0 s}(1+s)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right)ds \\ &\lesssim \left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)e^{-\eta_0 t},\end{aligned} \tag{13.2}$$

and similarly using (9.12) we have

(13.3)

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)(\cdot,t)\|_{W^{K+1,p}(x;\mathbb{R})} &\lesssim (1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}E_0 \\ &\quad + \zeta_1(t)^2\int_0^t (1+t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}}\left(e^{-2\eta_0 s}+e^{-\eta_0 s}(1+s)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right)ds \\ &\lesssim \left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

yielding in particular that $\|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)\|_{H^{K+1}}$ is arbitrarily small if E_0 and $\zeta_1(t)$ are, thus verifying the hypothesis of Proposition 13.2 below. By the nonlinear damping estimate given in Proposition 13.2, therefore, the size of v in $H^K(\mathbb{R})$ can be controlled by its size in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ together with H^K estimates on the derivatives of the phase function $\tilde\alpha$. In particular, we have for some positive constants θ_1 and θ_2

$$\begin{aligned}\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}^2 &\lesssim e^{-\theta_1 t}E_0^2 + \left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)^2\int_0^t e^{-\theta_2(t-s)}\left(e^{-2\eta_0 s}+(1+s)^{-\frac{3}{4}}\right)ds \\ &\lesssim e^{-\theta_1 t}E_0^2 + \left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)^2 e^{-2\eta_0 t} \\ &\lesssim \left(E_0+\zeta_1(t)^2\right)^2 e^{-2\eta_0 t}.\end{aligned}$$

This estimate together with (13.3) in the case $p=2$ completes the proof. □

Proposition 13.2. *Assuming $(H1)-(H2)$, let $v(\cdot,0) \in H^K(\mathbb{R})$ (for v as in (12.1)) and suppose that for some $T>0$ the $H^K(\mathbb{R})$ norm of v and the $H^{K+1}(\mathbb{R})$ norms of $\tilde\alpha_t(\cdot,t)$ and $\tilde\alpha_x(\cdot,t)$ remain bounded by a sufficiently small constant for all $0 \le t \le T$. Then there are constants θ_1 and θ_2 such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}^2 \lesssim & e^{-\theta_1 t}\|v(\cdot,0)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}^2 \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{-\theta_2(t-s)}\left(\|v(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2 + \|(\tilde\alpha_t,\tilde\alpha_x)(\cdot,s)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}^2\right)ds.\end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \le t \le T$.

Proof. Subtracting from the equation (12.3) for u the equation for $\bar{u}$, we may write the nonlinear perturbation equation as

$$v_t - Df(\bar{u})v - v_{xx} = Q + \tilde{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_t - \tilde{u}_t\tilde{\alpha}_x - (\tilde{u}_x\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x + f(\tilde{u})\psi_x, \tag{13.4}$$

where it is understood that derivatives of $\tilde{u}$ appearing on the right-hand side are evaluated at $(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t)$. Using (12.5) to replace $\tilde{u}_x$ and $\tilde{u}_t$ respectively by $\bar{u}_x + v_x - (\bar{u}_x+v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}$ and $\bar{u}_t + v_t - (\bar{u}_x+v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_t}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}$, and moving the resulting $v_t\tilde{\alpha}_x$ term to the left-hand side of (13.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\tilde{\alpha}_x)v_t - v_{xx} = &-Df(\bar{u})v + Q + (\bar{u}_x+v_x)\tilde{\alpha}_t \\ &- ((\bar{u}_x+v_x)\tilde{\alpha}_x)_x + \left((\bar{u}_x+v_x)\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_x^2}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}\right)_x + f(\tilde{u})\tilde{\alpha}_x\end{aligned} \tag{13.5}$$

Taking the L^2 inner product in x of $\sum_{j=0}^{K}\frac{(-1)^j\partial_x^{2j}v}{1+\tilde{\alpha}_x}$ against (13.5), integrating by parts, and rearranging the resulting terms, we arrive at the inequality

$$\partial_t\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})} \leq -\theta\|\partial_x^{K+1}v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + C\left(\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})} + \|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)(\cdot,s)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}\right),$$

for some $\theta > 0$, $C > 0$, so long as $\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}$ remains bounded, and $\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}$ and $\|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)(\cdot,t)\|_{H^{K+1}(\mathbb{R})}$ remain sufficiently small. Using the Sobolev interpolation $\|g\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})} \leq \tilde{C}^{-1}\|\partial_x^{K+1}g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \tilde{C}\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ for $\tilde{C} > 0$ sufficiently large, we obtain

$$\partial_t\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}(t) \leq -\tilde{\theta}\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})} + C\left(\|v(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)(\cdot,s)\|^2_{H^K(\mathbb{R})}\right)$$

from which the desired estimate follows by Gronwall's inequality. □

14. Point-wise Nonlinear Iteration and Point-wise Bound on the Perturbation

In this section, we give a proof of the Theorem 1.7 using the improved pointwise bounds stated in Proposition 1.5. Associated with the solution $(u,\tilde{\alpha})$ of the integral system (12.12) and (12.13), we define

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_2(t) := \sup_{0\leq s\leq t, x\in\mathbb{R}}\Big(&\|v(x,s)\|_{W^{2,\infty}(x;\mathbb{R})}(1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{\frac{\eta_0}{2}s+\frac{|x|^2}{2Ms}} + \|\tilde{\alpha}\|_{W^{3,\infty}(x;\mathbb{R})}(s) \\ &+\|(\tilde{\alpha}_t,\tilde{\alpha}_x)\|_{W^{3,\infty}(x;\mathbb{R})}(s)(1+s)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{14.1}$$

Lemma 14.1. *For all $t \geq 0$ for which $\zeta_2(t)$ is finite, some $C > 0$,*

$$\zeta_2(t) \leq C(E_0 + \zeta_2(t)^2). \tag{14.2}$$

Proof. Let us recall the definition of the Gaussian probability density function

$$K(x,t) = (2\pi t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2t}},$$

and the semigroup property $K(\cdot,t_1) * K(\cdot,t_2) = K(\cdot,t_1+t_2)$.

If we define

$$K_M(x,t) = t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{Mt}},$$

we represent it in terms of K as

$$K_M(x,t) = \sqrt{\pi M}\left(2\pi\left(\frac{Mt}{2}\right)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\left(\frac{Mt}{2}\right)}} = \sqrt{\pi M}\cdot K(x,\frac{Mt}{2}).$$

The semigroup property becomes $K_M(\cdot,t_1) * K_M(\cdot,t_2) = \sqrt{\pi M}\cdot K_M(\cdot,t_1+t_2)$.

Using the representations on Q, R, S and T, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q(y,s)| &\leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-1}e^{-\eta_0 s-\frac{|y|^2}{Ms}} \leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}s^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0 s-\frac{|y|^2}{Ms}},\\
|R_y(y,s)| &\leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}} \leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}s^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}},\\
|(\partial_y^2+\partial_s)S(y,s)| &\leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}} \leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}s^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}},\\
|T(y,s)| &\leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}} \leq C\zeta_2^2(t)(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}s^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}},
\end{aligned}$$

for $0<s\leq t$.

From (12.12), using the bounds on $\tilde{H}$ and the four estimates above we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
|v(x,t)| &\leq CE_0\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0 t}\frac{e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{Mt}}}{\sqrt{t}}\cdot\frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{M}}}{\sqrt{1}}dy\\
&\quad +C\zeta_2^2(t)\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}\frac{e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{M(t-s)}}}{\sqrt{t-s}}\cdot e^{-\eta_0 s}\frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}}dyds\\
&\quad +C\zeta_2^2(t)\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\eta_0(t-s)}\frac{e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{M(t-s)}}}{\sqrt{t-s}}\cdot e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}s}\frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}}dyds\\
&\leq CE_0\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-\eta_0 t}K_M(x-y,t)\cdot K_M(y,1)dy\\
&\quad +C\zeta_2^2(t)\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-\eta_0 t}(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}K_M(x-y,t-s)\cdot K_M(y,s)dyds\\
&\quad +C\zeta_2^2(t)\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}e^{-\eta_0 t+\frac{\eta_0}{2}s}(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}K_{2M}(x-y,t-s)\cdot K_{2M}(y,s)dyds\\
&\leq C\sqrt{\pi M}E_0e^{-\eta_0 t}K_M(x,t+1)\\
&\quad +C\sqrt{\pi M}\zeta_2^2(t)e^{-\eta_0 t}\int_0^t(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}K_M(x,t)ds\\
&\quad +C\sqrt{2\pi M}\zeta_2^2(t)e^{-\eta_0 t}\int_0^t e^{\frac{\eta_0}{2}s}(1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}K_{2M}(x,t)ds\\
&\leq CE_0e^{-\eta_0 t}K_M(x,t+1)+C\zeta_2^2(t)2\sqrt{t}e^{-\eta_0 t}K_M(x,t)\\
&\quad +C\zeta_2^2(t)e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}t}K_{2M}(x,t)\\
&\leq C(E_0+\zeta_2^2(t))(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2}t-\frac{|x|^2}{2Mt}}.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\partial_t^k \partial_x^m \tilde{\alpha}(x,t)| \;\leq\; & CE_0 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+t)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} e^{-\eta_0|y|} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{M}} dy \\
& + C\zeta_2^2(t) \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+t-s)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} e^{-\eta_0|y|} e^{-\eta_0 s} (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}} dy ds \\
& + C\zeta_2^2(t) \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (1+t-s)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} e^{-\eta_0|y|} e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2} s} (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}} dy ds \\
\leq\; & CE_0 (1+t)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} \\
& + C\zeta_2^2(t) \int_0^t (1+t-s)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\eta_0 s} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0|y|} \frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}} dy \right) ds \\
& + C\zeta_2^2(t) \int_0^t (1+t-s)^{-\frac{m+k}{2}} (1+s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\eta_0}{2} s} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\eta_0|y|} \frac{e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2Ms}}}{\sqrt{s}} dy \right) ds \\
\leq\; & \begin{cases} C(E_0 + \zeta_2^2(t))(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } m+k \geq 1; \\ C(E_0 + \zeta_2^2(t)) & \text{for } m+k = 0. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Thus the Lemma follows. Finally, we give the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. By continuous induction, we have that $\zeta_2(t) \leq 2CE_0$. Hence the stated estimate on $v(x,t) = \tilde{u}(x+\tilde{\alpha}(x,t),t) - \bar{u}(x)$ follows. Now we prove the other two bounds on $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\partial_t^k \partial_x^m \tilde{\alpha}$. From the formula (12.13) for $\partial_t^k \partial_x^m \tilde{\alpha}$ and the bounds on $Q, R_y, (\partial_y^2 + \partial_s)S, T$, we obtain for $t \geq 1$ ($\tilde{\alpha}(x,t) = 0$ when $0 < t < 1$),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |\partial_t^k \partial_x^m \tilde{\alpha}(x,t)| \\
\leq & C \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| \frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y+t)^2}{Mt}}}{\sqrt{t}} - \frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y-t)^2}{Mt}}}{\sqrt{t}} \right| e^{-\eta|y|} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{M}} dy \\
& + C \int_1^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| \frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y+(t-s))^2}{M(t-s)}}}{\sqrt{t-s}} - \frac{e^{-\frac{(x-y-(t-s))^2}{M(t-s)}}}{\sqrt{t-s}} \right| e^{-\eta|y| - \eta_0 s - \frac{|y|^2}{Ms}} dy ds \\
\leq & C \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(K_M(x+t-y,t) + K_M(x-t-y,t) \right) K_M(y,1) e^{-\eta|y|} dy \\
& + C \int_1^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} K_M(x+(t-s)-y, t-s) K_M(y,s) \sqrt{s} e^{-\eta|y| - \eta_0 s} dy ds \\
& + C \int_1^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} K_M(x-(t-s)-y, t-s) K_M(y,s) \sqrt{s} e^{-\eta|y| - \eta_0 s} dy ds \\
\leq & C \left(K_M(x+t, t+1) + K_M(x-t, t+1) \right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+C\int_1^t K_M(x+(t-s),t)\sqrt{s}e^{-\eta_0 s}ds + C\int_1^t K_M(x-(t-s),t)\sqrt{s}e^{-\eta_0 s}ds$$
$$\leq CE_0\left(e^{-\frac{|x+t|^2}{Mt}}+e^{-\frac{|x-t|^2}{Mt}}\right).$$

The bound on $\tilde{\alpha}$ can be obtained by integrating the bound on $\tilde{\alpha}_x(x,t)$ from x to $\pm\infty$, using the fact that $\lim_{x\to\pm\infty}\tilde{\alpha}(x,t)=0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.7. □

References

[A] D.G. Aronson, *Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 73, Number 6 (1967), 890-896.

[Cr] J. Cronin, *Ordinary Differential Equations: Introduction and Qualitative Theory,* Third Edition (Chapman & Hall/CRC Pure and Applied Mathematics).

[GZ] R. Gardner and K. Zumbrun, *The Gap Lemma and geometric criteria for instability of viscous shock profiles*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 51 (1998), no. 7, 797–855.

[He] D. Henry, *Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 840, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1981.

[JNRZ] M. Johnson, P. Noble, L.M. Rodrigues and K. Zumbrun, *Nonlocalized Modulation of Periodic Reaction Diffusion Waves: Nonlinear Stability*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 207(2013), no.2, 693-715.

[JZ] M. Johnson and K. Zumbrun, *Nonlinear stability of spatially-periodic traveling-wave solutions of systems of reaction diffusion equations*, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré - Analyse non linéaire, 28(2011), issue 4, 471-483.

[Li] Y. Li, *Scalar Green function bounds for instantaneous shock location and one-dimensional stability of viscous shock waves*, Quart. Appl. Math.

[MaZ] C. Mascia and K. Zumbrun, *Stability of Large-Amplitude Viscous Shock Profiles of Hyperbolic-Parabolic Systems*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 172(2004), no.1, 93-131.

[N] J. Nash, *Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations*, Amer. J. Math. 80 (1958), 931-954.

[Sa] D.H. Sattinger, *On the stability of waves of nonlinear parabolic systems*, Advances in Math. 22(1976), no. 3, 312-355.

[TZ] B. Texier and K. Zumbrun, *Relative Poincare-Hopf bifurcation and galloping instability of traveling waves*, Methods Appl. Anal. 12(2005), no. 4, 349-380.

[Z] K. Zumbrun, *Instantaneous shock location and one-dimensional nonlinear stability of viscous shock waves*, Quart. Appl. Math. 69(2011), 177-202.

[ZH] K. Zumbrun and P. Howard, *Pointwise Semigroup Methods and Stability of Viscous Shcok Waves*, Indiana. Univ. Math. J. 47(1998), 741-871.

Indiana University, 831 East Third Street, Rawles Hall, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, U.S.A.

E-mail address: YL37@umail.iu.edu